

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 September 2019

**by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 27 September 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/19/3231927**

**2 Parkwood Road, Shipley BD18 4SS**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr M Akhtar against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
  - The application Ref 19/00598/HOU, dated 11 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2019.
  - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing garage and construction of gym/storage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing garage and construction of gym/storage at 2 Parkwood Road, Shipley BD18 4SS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00598/HOU, dated 11 February 2019, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 100, 200A.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of the area, and (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 4 Parkwood Road, with regard to outlook.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The proposed development would sit prominently within the street scene, between the two storey dwellings at 2 Parkwood Road and 11 Fern Hill Road and would be located in the same position as the existing flat roofed double garage. As there is already a building present in this location, and as the proposed development would not be of a significantly different scale to this building, it would not erode the gap between the two dwellings. Furthermore, the proposed development would be single storey in height and significantly lower than both of the dwellings. As such, a clear gap would remain between buildings so that a terracing effect would not arise.

4. I conclude that the proposed development would not result in terracing and would not harm the character and appearance of the area. There would therefore be no conflict with the design guidance of Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017 (CS) and the Householder Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD), all of which seek to ensure that development does not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

#### *Living conditions*

5. As is the case with the existing garage, the proposed development would be set away from the common boundary with No 4. The development would result in an increase in the eaves height of the building, and the addition of a pitched roof. However, the increase in the eaves height would not be significant and the roof would be shallow in its pitch. Furthermore, the roof would slope away from the common boundary. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed development would not have an overbearing impact and would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 4. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy DS5 of the CS or the SPD, both of which seek to protect the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

#### **Other Matters**

6. A representation has been received which questions whether the proposed development could be used as living accommodation for the family. The building is proposed to be used for ancillary residential purposes, such as a gym and storage, and not as a separate unit of accommodation.

#### **Conditions**

7. The Council has requested conditions relating to the time period for the implementation of the planning permission and with respect to the approved plans. I consider that both of these conditions are required to define the terms of the permission. As the plans submitted specify the materials to be used, and these are appropriate in this context, it is not necessary to impose a condition relating to this matter.
8. The Council's delegated report suggests that a condition could be imposed to tie the use of the building to the existing dwelling. However, there is no suggestion that the building is to constitute a planning unit separate from the dwelling. It is not therefore necessary to impose such a condition.

#### **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal, subject to conditions, should be allowed.

*Graham Wraight*

INSPECTOR